

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/819,252 | WALDMAN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | MISOOK YU, Ph.D. | 1642 | |

All Participants:

(1) MISOOK YU, Ph.D.

(2) Daniel Monaco.

Date of Interview: 22 December 2003

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: _____

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: RCE instruction requesting consideration of the amendment filed Aug. 19, 2002 is not clear because the amendment was already entered and considered by the Office. Applicant requested the Office to enter the after-final amendment filed on Apr. 09, 2003 over the interview..